

**Missouri Department of Health
Hazardous Substances Emergency Events Surveillance (HSEES) Program
2001 Prevention Outreach Plan – Preliminary Summary of Activities**

Prevention Activity #1: 1999 Event Summary Reports by County

Description:

Reports summarizing 1999 event data, such as the number of events per county, substances released, injuries, evacuations and “interesting events”, were to be developed and distributed to the above target groups. The reports were going to be available to members of the general public through the HSEES web site. Links to the reports were to be included on the Department of Health and Senior Service’s “Community Data Profile” web page for each county. Reports were also going to be sent to fixed facilities within these counties that had at least one reportable event within the previous calendar year.

Summary of Activities:

Since the 1999 data was not finalized until October 10, 2001, this activity could not be completed during FFY’2001. ATSDR granted approval to consider the distribution of mercury fact sheets to Missouri’s schools as a substitute prevention activity for 2001 (see Activity #2).

Prevention Activity #2: Fact Sheets on Mercury, Chlorine and Lead (two activities)

Description:

Fact sheets on mercury, chlorine and lead were developed and distributed in September 2001. Chlorine was chosen due to the high incidence of injury to one or more persons as a result of exposure. Lead and mercury were chosen due to the long-term health affects from repeated exposure. All three substances are within the top ten substances released during the 1994-1998 data analysis period.

Summary of Activities:

Fact sheets were developed on mercury, chlorine and lead using the same format designed for the fact sheets prepared in the FFY'2000 prevention plan (Activity #1). The fact sheets were also published on the Missouri HSEES web site. The fact sheets were distributed to 304 facilities in Missouri who handle, store, use, manufacture or transport any of these three substances, based on the March 2000 facility survey conducted for Prevention Activity #1 in the FFY'2000 plan.

The mercury fact sheet was also distributed to all public and private K-12 schools in Missouri. A cover letter accompanied the fact sheet and provided additional information on available resources relating to the handling and use of mercury in schools.

Lessons Learned:

The lessons learned were a result of the initial survey conducted in March 2000. Although the HSEES program fact sheet was enclosed with the survey, a substantial number of calls were received by the HSEES Coordinator from facilities that had questions about the program, or thought that the HSEES program was another regulatory program they would be required to report to. These calls alerted us to the fact that significant efforts should be made to increase awareness of the existence and purpose of the HSEES program among various industries in the state.

Evaluation Measures:

Based on the number of facilities that received targeted substance fact sheets, we believe that this activity significantly increased awareness of the program, in addition to providing educational materials on specific substances to over 300 facilities.

This activity will be considered effective if a decrease of 10% or more is noted in the number of events during calendar year 2002 in which mercury, chlorine and/or lead are involved. The number of events reported in 2002 will be compared to the baseline established for 2000 events to determine whether the number of events has actually decreased. Effectiveness will also be measured by the number of fact sheets that are distributed and the number of hits on the HSEES web site.

Prevention Activity #3: Contracts with Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPCs)

Description:

Contracts were developed to provide support for comprehensive, community-based prevention activities at the local level. Each LEPC accepting the contract is required to conduct six educational presentations during calendar year 2001. At least one presentation must be targeted to each of the standard population groups (employees, first responders and the general public). In addition, each presentation must include information on the HSEES program, which will be provided by the HSEES Coordinator. The HSEES Coordinator has provided fact sheets, quarterly reports, reporting forms, and county and industry specific data upon request. The LEPCs are reimbursed \$166.67 for each presentation given after the appropriate reports have been submitted and are reviewed/approved by the HSEES Coordinator to process payment. Funds are provided through the HSEES grant.

Summary of Activities:

The LEPCs in the five counties with the highest number of events (1994-1998) were contacted as soon as the Missouri HSEES program learned that funding had been approved for this activity. All five LEPCs initially agreed to sign the contract. However, since this was a new type of contract for DHSS, several months were required in order for the contract to be approved through administrative channels. In addition, it took several weeks for vendor numbers to be established in the state accounting system in order to process the contracts.

Once the language was approved, contracts were mailed to all five LEPCs in January 2001. Two contracts were signed immediately and returned; however, the remaining three counties did not return the contract. Follow-up calls and repeated requests were made, and in March 2001, all three decided not to participate in the contract. Additional contacts were made with the next three counties within the top ten counties with the highest number of events, but they declined as well. At that point, it was too far into the contract period to find additional LEPCs interested in participating.

Lessons Learned:

The main lesson learned from this activity was to expand the field of potential contractors from five to the top 25 counties, in the event an LEPC decides not to participate after the contracts are already released. This was done for the contracts funded during FY'2002, and all five contracts have been released. In addition, the time frames required by the DHSS administrative process are quite lengthy and there was not enough time to meet those time frames, given that we did not receive notification of approval of the funds requested in the FY'2001 grant application until July 31.

Effectiveness Measures:

Each LEPC must include representatives from law enforcement, fire fighting, health, local government, hospitals, broadcast and print media, community groups, owners/operators of facilities, and elected state and local officials. By enhancing our partnership with LEPCs, we will increase awareness regarding the goals and objectives of the HSEES program among local governmental agencies, health care providers, first responders, fixed facilities, and other community groups. The number of collaborative relationships with these groups has increased significantly as a result of this activity, and has enhanced the relationships between the county LEPC and the county local public health agency.

Prevention Activity #4: Educational Presentations at National/State/Local Conferences

Description:

Information on the HSEES program has been provided at conferences and training sessions sponsored by the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) and other agencies that target emergency management directors, responders, city/county officials, and other parties.

Summary of Activities:

HSEES program information has been presented at nine conferences/training sessions during the period covered by the prevention outreach plan. A complete listing of presentations is included in this report.

Lessons Learned:

These conferences attract a large number and variety of personnel from the target groups listed, and is one of the most effective methods available to establish relationships and share information with these groups. National, regional, statewide and local conferences allow us to reach the maximum number of people in the target groups in the most effective manner.

Feedback received during and after the presentations indicates that many of those in the target audience were unaware of the existence of the HSEES program. This has alerted us to the fact that significant efforts should be made to increase awareness of the existence and purpose of the HSEES program among responders, health care providers, emergency management organizations, and the general public.

Evaluation Measures:

This activity has significantly increased the knowledge of the HSEES program for the individuals attending these presentations. The presentations have also raised awareness at the local level of the impact of, and potential for, hazardous substance releases throughout the state. Participants were also asked to complete evaluations at individual presentations. The results of these evaluations are also included in this summary.

Educational Presentations Given - 2001

Missouri Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Conference (Columbia) – March 27, 2001

Topic: Presented information on the spatial data analysis of ammonia releases in Missouri using ArcView software. Specifically focused on counties or areas of the state where ammonia releases primarily occur due to methamphetamine production.

Audience: GIS professionals from a variety of fields (public safety, industry, health, etc.)

No. of Attendees: 40

SEMA/MEPA Annual Conference (Lake Ozark) - April 17, 2001

Topic: Presented information regarding the HSEES program during two 1½ hour breakout sessions. Distributed over 100 copies of the five substance fact sheets and the Missouri HSEES Five Year Data Analysis. Evaluation forms were given to all participants. In addition, SEMA also conducted a separate evaluation. The results of both evaluations are attached.

Audience: Responders, emergency management officials, public health agencies

No. of Attendees: 97

Environmental Health & Communicable Disease Conference (Lake Ozark) – May 10, 2001

Topic: Presented information on the importance of emergency preparedness planning for local public health agencies, and emphasized the importance of working with the local emergency planning committees (LEPCs). The presentation was given with a panel of two other speakers: Bob Dopp, Executive Director of the Missouri Emergency Response Commission; and Dan Henson, an Environmental Public Health Specialist who was involved in a recent nitric acid spill in Laclede County where the communication between the LEPC/LPHA was shown to be ineffective. Coordinated the entire presentation, including lining up other presenters and preparing the conference abstract. Distributed over 100 copies of the HSEES Five Year Data Analysis and the five substance fact sheets at the exhibit area.

Audience: Local public health agency staff

No. of Attendees: 40

Southeast District Local Health Administrators (Poplar Bluff) – June 14, 2001

Topic: Presented the entire overview of the HSEES program, five-year data, prevention outreach activities, and the role of the local public health agency. Distributed copies of the Five Year Data Analysis and substance fact sheets.

Audience: Local public health agency administrators for counties in the Southeast District

No. of Attendees: 20

Northwest District Local Health Administrators (Kansas City) – August 23, 2001

Topic: Presented the entire overview of the HSEES program, five-year data, prevention outreach activities, and the role of the local public health agency. Distributed copies of the Five Year Data Analysis and substance fact sheets.

Audience: Local public health agency administrators for counties in the Northwest District

No. of Attendees: 15

Southwest District Local Health Administrators (Springfield) - August 24, 2001

Topic: Presented the entire overview of the HSEES program, five-year data, prevention outreach activities, and the role of the local public health agency. Distributed copies of the Five Year Data Analysis and substance fact sheets.

Audience: Local public health agency administrators for counties in the Southwest District

No. of Attendees: 20

Indoor Air Quality Conference (Kansas City) – September 26, 2001

Topic: Provided tables, graphs, GIS maps and other data on methamphetamine releases reported to the HSEES system 1997-2000. The data was presented by Gale Carlson, Environmental Section Chief of the DHSS Section for Environmental Public Health, during one of the conference sessions.

Audience: Environmental and public health staff

No. of Attendees: 50

Communicable Disease/Case Investigation Inservice (Jefferson City) - November 2, 2001

Topic: Presented an overview of the HSEES program, and the role of the local public health agency as a partner and notification source. Specific emphasis placed on the importance of reporting signs and symptoms of biological and chemical exposure due to increased threats of terrorist acts. Distributed 50 copies of the Five-Year Data Analysis and all substance fact sheets.

Audience: Local public health agency disease surveillance and environmental health specialists

No. of Attendees: 50

Environmental Emergency Response Inservice (Jefferson City) – December 13, 2001

Topic: Presented an overview of the HSEES program, and the role of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) as a partner and notification source. Specific emphasis placed on the importance of reporting signs and symptoms of biological and chemical exposure due to increased threats of terrorist acts. Distributed 25 copies of the Five-Year Data Analysis and all substance fact sheets.

Audience: DNR Environmental Emergency Response personnel

No. of Attendees: 25

Hazardous Substance Emergency Events Surveillance (HSEES) Presentation SEMA Annual Conference Evaluation Summary - April 17, 2001

A total of 97 individuals attended the two 1 1/2 hour breakout sessions. 81 evaluations were returned (83.5%). The total of responses does not always equal 81 due to the fact that not all forms were completely filled out and some questions allowed more than one choice.

| | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | No Opinion | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|--|-------------------|----------|------------|-------|----------------|
| 1. I have learned something new from the presentation. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 49 | 30 |
| 2. The material was interesting. | 1 | 1 | 2 | 51 | 26 |
| 3. The material was clearly presented. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 40 | 38 |
| 4. The material was well organized. | 1 | 0 | 1 | 41 | 38 |
| 5. The information presented was relevant to my occupation and/or community. | 1 | 3 | 8 | 46 | 23 |

Agencies represented:

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 24 Local Emergency Planning Committee | 10 County/local government |
| 25 Emergency management/preparedness | 6 HAZMAT response team |
| 23 Other | 2 Environmental agency |
| 21 Responder (fire, police, EMT, etc.) | 2 Hospital/health care agency |

Other agencies represented:

| | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Air Force Nat'l Security | LPHA (2) | Other state government (5) |
| Coroner/funeral/mass fatality | National Guard | US Air Force |
| Corporate/industry staff | Red Cross (2) | US Dept. of Transportation |
| Education | Salvation Army | WMD Civil Support Team |

Were you aware of the HSEES program prior to attending this presentation?

15 Yes
62 No

If yes, how did you learn of the program?

9 Quarterly and/or annual reports
4 Attended a previous presentation
1 Web site
1 Missouri Epidemiologist

Would your agency utilize HSEES data if it were available for download from the web site?

59 Yes
14 No
5 Maybe

If yes, what would you use the data for?

51 Emergency planning and preparedness
36 Enhanced training and education for responders
26 Determining populations at risk
26 Providing information to the general public
14 Providing information to industries and businesses
3 Other

The conference organizers also conducted a separate evaluation on different aspects of the presentation. A total of 80 evaluation forms were returned to SEMA. Participants were asked to rate each component on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the lowest, 5 being the highest). A total of 80 evaluation forms were received. The total number of ratings given to each component are listed below:

| Component | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Audiovisual materials * | 2 | 1 | 14 | 33 | 28 |
| Handout materials | 0 | 0 | 13 | 32 | 30 |
| Subject knowledge | 1 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 49 |
| Addressed participant needs | 1 | 0 | 12 | 34 | 33 |
| Instructional techniques and presentation | 0 | 0 | 10 | 40 | 30 |
| Answered questions completely | 0 | 1 | 5 | 38 | 36 |
| Subject material was what you expected | 0 | 3 | 11 | 30 | 36 |
| Time allotment adequate | 0 | 1 | 9 | 39 | 31 |

* Projector supplied by conference organizers failed during first breakout session

Additional comments made:

- Good presentation!
- Great amount of grace when computer locked up.
- Great job for a "statistician". One of the best presenters at this conference!
- Great presentation!
- Instructor adapted very well while the A/V problems were worked out - kept presentation on track and transitioned smoothly when problems were worked out.
- Not what I expected, but it was better!
- Projector didn't work. Too much foot traffic to fix it during presentation made things worse, not better.
- Very good information.
- Very interesting!